



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/807,783

03/24/2004

James B. Kargman

P06,0191-01

4264

26574 7590 09/01/2009

SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
233 S. Wacker Drive-Suite 6600
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473

EXAMINER

HAIDER, FAWAAD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/807,783	Applicant(s) KARGMAN, JAMES B.	
	Examiner FAWAAD HAIDER	Art Unit 3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dragosh et al (6,078,886) in view of Suthar (2004/0143503) and Harada (2003/0210277).

Re Claims 1, 16: Dragosh discloses comprising the steps of: providing an order entry terminal for a customer to use to specify an order for a pizza, the terminal being connected to a point-of-sale system and including a display screen, voice synthesis generator, microphone, speaker, voice recognition processor capable of detecting the customer's spoken words and microprocessor controller (see col.4, lines 37-44, col.9, lines 31-60, col.3, lines 5-27, 47-51); prompting the customer to enter an order by speaking words in a human voice (see col.9, lines 31-60, col.4, lines 37-56, col.7, lines 14-31); detecting the customer's spoken words, the customer's spoken words specifying an order for a pizza having ingredients and ingredient locations (see col.2, line 62 –

Art Unit: 3627

col.4, line 43, col.6, lines 29-50); confirming the accuracy of the customer's order (see col.9, lines 31-60, col.6, lines 57-col.7, line 7); and entering the customer's order into the point-of-sale system (see col.4, lines 37-56).

However, Dragosh fails to disclose displaying a menu, and GUI. Meanwhile, Suthar discloses displaying a graphical user interface to permit the customer to manually alter the order (see [0117, 0131]); and capable of displaying a menu of food items available for order (see [0004]). From the teaching of Suthar, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dragosh's invention with Suthar's use of a menu, GUI, and an image in order to have a "system with greater efficiencies for the restaurant owner and greater ease for the diner (see Suthar Abstract)."

However, both Dragosh and Suthar fail to disclose a photo-realistic image. Meanwhile, Harada discloses a photo-realistic image of a pizza according to the order specified by the customer, the photo-realistic image depicting the ingredients and ingredient locations specified in the customer's order as detected in the detecting step (see [0012]). From the teaching of Harada, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify both Dragosh's and Suthar's inventions with Harada's use of a photo-realistic image in order "resulting in a user friendly ordering system (see Harada Abstract)."

Re Claim 2: Dragosh discloses wherein the method further includes the step of detecting the customer's initiation of the order entry process and responding by

Art Unit: 3627

presenting a spoken greeting to a customer in synthesized human speech (see col.9, lines 31-60).

Re Claim 3: Dragosh discloses wherein the step of prompting the customer to enter an order for a pizza comprises the step prompting the user to enter their order by speaking in a narrative fashion (see col.7, lines 14-31).

Re Claim 4: Dragosh discloses wherein the step of detecting the customer's spoken words comprises the step of analyzing the customer's spoken narrative toward identifying the particular food order being placed (see col.4, lines 37-56).

Re Claim 5: Dragosh discloses wherein the step of prompting the customer to enter an order for a pizza comprises the step presenting a series of two or more individual prompts to the customer soliciting the user to enter an order by responding to individual prompts presented one at a time to the customer (see col.7, line 18).

Re Claim 6: Dragosh discloses wherein the step of detecting the customer's spoken words comprises the step of analyzing each of the customer's spoken responses provided in response to the individual prompts toward identifying the particular food order being placed (see col.7, line 18).

Re Claim 7: Dragosh discloses wherein the step of prompting the user comprises generating and presenting to the user words in a synthesized human voice (see col.7, line 18).

Re Claim 8: Dragosh discloses wherein the step of detecting the customer's spoken words further includes the step of automatically identifying the language spoken

by the customer toward generating further prompts to the customer in the same language spoken by the customer (see Figure 2).

Re Claim 9: Dragosh discloses wherein the method further includes the step of providing the customer the ability to identify a preferred language to be spoken to the customer (see Figure 2).

Re Claims 10-15: Dragosh fails to disclose the following limitations. Suthar discloses wherein the step of displaying a photo-realistic image of a pizza according to the order specified by the customer comprises the step of displaying a static image of a cooked pizza (see [0168]). Suthar discloses wherein the step of displaying a photo-realistic image of a pizza according to the order specified by the customer comprises the step of displaying an animation which illustrates the preparation of the pizza by the addition of each raw ingredient called for by the customer's order (see [0168]). Suthar discloses wherein the method further includes the step of displaying to the customer a user interface which includes a menu identifying various food items available for order by the customer (see [0004]). Suthar discloses wherein the order entry terminal is located within a restaurant (see [0004]). Suthar discloses wherein the order entry terminal comprises a customer's personal computer located remote to a restaurant and which is in turn connected to the point-of-sale system via an Internet connect (see [0004]). Suthar discloses wherein the order entry terminal is provided at a drive through location operated by a restaurant whereby a customer may place an order from a motor vehicle (see [0004]). From the teaching of Suthar, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dragosh's invention with

Art Unit: 3627

Suthar's use of a menu, GUI, and an image in order to have a "system with greater efficiencies for the restaurant owner and greater ease for the diner (see Suthar Abstract)."

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fawaad Haider whose telephone number is 571-272-7178. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fawaad Haider/
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

FIH

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627

Application/Control Number: 10/807,783
Art Unit: 3627

Page 8